

REMARKS

Claims 1,2 and 5-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 10-22 have been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention. By this Amendment, claims 7-9 are amended. No new matter is added.

The Office Action asserts that the claims of the present application are directed to two distinct inventions. Applicants hereby affirm the election of Group 2 (claims 7-9).

The Office Action rejects claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not sufficiently described in the specification. Applicants note that, while the terminology "non-vitreous", it is not used in the parent application, this feature is supported by the wording "it hasnumerous fine pores" (Page 6, line 1). Thus, while not necessarily agreeing with this rejection, Applicants have replaced the assertedly objectionable terminology with the terminology specifically recited in the specification. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,198,382) in view of Snyder et al. (WO 89/07163). Claims 8 and 9 are somewhat similarly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui et al. in view of Snyder et al., and further in view of Berkebille et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,996,037). These rejections are traversed as they may apply to the amended claims.

The object of the Matsui reference is opposite to that of the present invention. In particular, the Matsui reference is addressed to eliminate any pores, whereas the presently claimed invention is addressed to provide numerous fine pores.

Further, one of skill in the art would not have been expected to combine the teachings of Matsui with Snyder et al. Such aggregation would have been against the object of the Matsui reference, which eliminate any pores, and there is no reason why such aggregation would have been done to change the superior characteristic of Matsui material for the worse.

Thus, as Matsui teaches against the present invention, and as Snyder et al. and Berkebille et al. fail to make up for such teachings in Matsui, it is respectfully submitted that the presently claimed invention would not have been obvious any combinations of these references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are thus respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 01-2300, referencing attorney docket number 100120-00001.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert K. Carpenter". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line extending from the end of the name.

Robert K. Carpenter
Registration No. 34,794

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RKC/tdd